

[Phantom](#)
(insurgent)
04/04/06 10:54 AM



The 'Holocaust Lie: Made in America [Post [294539154](#)]

Category: News & Opinion (General) **Topic:** News & Current Events

Synopsis:

Source: <http://www.australiafreepress.org>

Published: April 4, 2006 **Author:** Australia Free Press

For Education and Discussion Only. Not for Commercial Use.

The 'Holocaust Lie: Made in America

No one denies that America and Germany incarcerated certain fractions of their populations under guard as war measures in the 1940s. Americans like to forget that at least 120,000 Americans of Japanese extraction were rounded up and put in concentration camps in the western United States for the duration of the war. However, they never permit the Germans to forget that Jews in German-controlled areas of Europe were treated likewise, though the reason was the same—a specific group was detained because some unknown fraction within it was a danger to the war effort and neither country was willing to risk letting it remain free for possible sabotage. There is no dispute about this. It happened.

However, what credible historical investigators worldwide now assert—and with excellent reasons—is that the German Reich did not give murderous orders concerning, and in fact did not actually murder, the Jews in its camps. The Jews suffered more in Germany than the Japanese suffered in America because the enemy's carpet bombing of Germany eventually destroyed the country's ability to properly maintain the camps. Everybody practically starved toward the end, Jews included. We must remember that Germany had perfectly good reasons to distrust the Jews as a group. As a nation within a nation they had utterly betrayed the country in World War I and moreover had literally declared worldwide economic and political war against Germany in 1933.



Auschwitz, Poland

Notwithstanding the understandably bad feelings against Jews in Germany, there were no despicable gas chambers or murderous crematoria. No tattoos. No lampshades. There were no sadistic plots but merely a war effort that failed—nothing for Germans to be ashamed of then or now. The indictment alleging systematic extermination of the Jews was and is false. Evidence was fabricated and/or purposely misrepresented and depositions falsified. In fact, the "Holocaust"

Lie was manufactured in America to justify the murder of captured German leaders as a precursor to the subordination of Germany, the Zionist-Jewish theft of Palestine, and genocidal American interference in the national affairs of Europe, each of which continues today.



German lawyer Horst Mahler, probably the most brilliant political mind in Europe today, with a vast knowledge of history and politics, recently attempted to travel to Tehran to talk about the foregoing at a conference called by Iranian historical scholars. The government of Germany—which is not an independent power even today in such matters—promptly ordered Herr Mahler's passport to be confiscated. On January 29, 2006, he protested in a letter to a certain Judge Dehne. Here in essential part (as translated by James Damon) is what he told the judge in that case (we omit footnotes and edit slightly for brevity):

"Perhaps it still has not gotten through to you that the leaders of world Jewry—especially the brothers Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson, the 'King of Diaspora Jews' Nahum Goldmann, the 'Emperor of America' Felix Frankfurter, the 'Right Hand of President Roosevelt' Sam Rosenman, and Rabbi [Stephen] Wise—did in fact meet together and conspire in order to lend credence to the historical lies of the 'International Military Tribunal' for the so called 'Nuremberg Trials' conducted against the leaders of the Reich, which the Jewish leaders planned in detail.



Samuel Rosenman

"The Holocaust laws of the OMF [Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule—i.e., the current Federal Republic of Germany] are continuing the judicial tradition of Stalinist show trials introduced into Germany by the victorious Allies with the International Military Tribunal. Far from being guided by a quest for reality and justice, they are a 'continuation of the war effort of the allied nations' in the words of U.S. Chief Prosecutor Robert Jackson. The OMF/Federal Republic courts which impose the Holocaust laws are nothing but a cover for despotic rule by the enemies of the Reich.

"Following unconditional capitulation by the Wehrmacht at the end of World War II, the victorious Allies had the power to write the history of the period as they saw fit. Not surprisingly, they labeled the Germans as 'criminal,' just as they had attempted to do during the First World War. They then established their postwar order of global Mammonism, based on the historical lies they fabricated. There is no possibility that our enemies could ever be inclined to give up the fruits of their victory over the Reich. They have always been determined and are still determined to hold onto them and protect the source of their wealth.



Willy Meller: 'Hour of Fate' (1944)

"He who builds his house on lies fears nothing more than the truth, which can tear it down at any time. This is the reason why, where historiography is concerned, the courts of the OMF/Federal Republic are bound to uphold the lies of the victorious powers in complete disregard for German public opinion. These courts are forced to uphold the Allies' lies against the Reich leadership exactly as they were proclaimed in the Nuremberg show trials

"According to Article 19 of its statute dated 8 August 1945, the International Military Tribunal was not bound by rules of evidence. According to the Article 20 of the same statute, the court could admit or reject evidence as it desired. Thus, rebuttal evidence that the defense could have used to counter the prosecutors' charges was frequently not taken into consideration.

"The basis of verdicts formulated by the Nuremberg court contain recitals of facts relating to the causes of the Second World War and the actions of German armed forces. According to Article 7 (1) [an FRG statute], they may not be questioned by German courts and authorities, even in the light of new historical evidence. Regarding content of school books, the ministries for education and the arts are also bound by these recitals of fact.

"Mr. Dehne, you know very well what is expected of you. By enforcing the Holocaust lies against historical truth you are acting as a direct agent of the destructive will of our enemies. Enforcement of the 'laws' of the OMF/Federal Republic assures that no actions can ever impair the interests of the Jews.

"Where Holocaust law is concerned, it is stated very openly. This situation necessitates a brief discussion of the Nuremberg Tribunal, which is a disgrace to Western civilization.

"The credit for inventing the Tribunal goes to two Lithuanian Jews, the brothers Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson, while credit for actual implementation belongs to the Jewish World Congress. World Congress President Nahum Goldmann, the 'King of the Diaspora Jews,' praised its creation as 'one of the greatest acts in the history of international justice and morals.' Nahum also gives us an idea of how Jewish circles were employed to introduce this idea to the U.S. government.



Nahum Goldmann (R) with Henry Kissinger

"He writes: 'Under the leadership of the two brothers Robinson, the Jewish World

Congress devoted a great deal of energy to the mental and moral preparation of these trials. To the great credit of the Roosevelt Administration, it unerringly adopted their principles and was able to put them through against the doubts of many among the Allies, especially in England.' Goldmann's account informs us just how this came about:

In the war years 1941 and 1942 we received information from Geneva concerning the destruction of Jews in the Nazi camps. This prompted Wise to decide that we had to visit the President and insist that the Allies warn the Germans about the consequences of their brutal policy and their certain punishment after the War... We arranged a weekend meeting with Rosenman in his summer villa near Roosevelt's "Hyde Park" in order to discuss what he should recommend to the President in Washington on Monday.



Franklin Roosevelt

It was a hot morning and we sitting on Rosenman's veranda without jackets and ties when we suddenly heard the signal that the President's car always gave. We suddenly realized that Roosevelt was coming to see Rosenman. We began putting on our coats and ties, but Rosenman said this was not necessary since Roosevelt attached no importance to formalities. Very soon the President's car stopped in front of the veranda, and before we could greet him, Roosevelt humorously remarked: "Well now, this is interesting—Sam Rosenman, Stephen Wise and Nahum Goldmann sitting here discussing what orders they want to give the President of the United States! Just imagine what the Nazis would give for a picture of this little scene." We began stuttering that we were discussing an urgent message from Europe that Rosenman wanted to show him on Monday. But Roosevelt just winked and said: "That's fine. Sam can come to see me on Monday and tell me what I'm supposed to do." Then he drove off.

"In another place Goldmann expresses the pleasures of exercising power even more intimately: 'Seduction can turn into passion... The sensation of seducing a woman might be more intense momentarily, but winning a statesman is something very similar During the time I lived in America nearly all presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—had their "Court Jews," wealthy people who helped finance their election campaigns and influential leaders of the Jewish community.'

"Another prominent 'Court Jew' was Felix Frankfurter, to whom Roosevelt was always 'very personally attached.' For many years Frankfurter was 'one of the most influential personalities in Washington,' which made him a competitor for the sobriquet 'Emperor of America' among some Jews. Many of Frankfurter's students were appointed to high positions in the Roosevelt administration. Goldman remarked that 'Frankfurter had no desire to perform on stage, but he derived all the more pleasure from pulling strings behind the scenes.'



Felix Frankfurter

"While the British government argued in favor of summarily executing captured German leaders—at least 50,000 of them—Stalin favored the show trials that were dear to his heart. The United States was also interested in such trials. Under international law, however, it was not possible to punish military personnel for carrying out orders. When Jacob Robinson suggested placing captured Germans before a tribunal anyway, American judges on the Supreme Court said he was crazy. 'What was unusual about the wartime actions of the Nazi officers?' they asked. It might have been possible to place Hitler and even Göring before a court, but certainly not ordinary military men who conducted themselves as loyal soldiers and carried out orders. Finally Robinson succeeded in persuading Supreme Court Judge Robert Jackson to accept his point of view.

"Robert H. Jackson (1892-1954), a close friend and trusted adviser of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had served as Assistant Attorney General from 1936 to 1939 and as Attorney General in 1940 and 1941. He was of the opinion that an Allied military tribunal would be 'a continuation of the war efforts of the allied nations.' At war's end Jackson was sent to Europe with instructions to juridically brand Germany for all time as the aggressor nation solely responsible for World War II.



Georg Slyterman von Langeweyde: 'Knight' (ca. 1935)
'Victory or defeat rests in God's hands/But we are masters and king of our honor.'Caption (translation)

"On Roosevelt's orders, Judge Samuel Rosenman had gone to London at the beginning of April 1945 in order to develop plans for a collective trial of 'German War Criminals.' On 5 April Lord Chancellor Sir John Simon, head of the British juridical system, had argued for summary execution of Hitler and his cohorts without any kind of trial. British Attorney General Sir David Maxwell Fyfe informed Rosenman that he also was 'personally in favor of the method of summary execution.' On the next day, however, Simon announced that Washington needed 'judicial proceedings before executions.'

"Obviously, those who thought up the tribunal idea had persuaded the 'head of the British legal system' of the advantage of having a high ranking international 'Judiciary' create the 'manifest obviousness' necessary to support the historical lies about German criminality and war guilt. But would any judge accept the idea that the victorious Allies' shooting of 50,000 captured National Socialists proved the 50,000 victims had committed the cruel deeds of which they were accused by their enemies? That was most unlikely. Any 'judge' who accepted the notion that being a victim of murder proves that the victim of murder had committed a capital offense and therefore makes his guilt obvious, would presumably land in an insane asylum.

"After Roosevelt's death, and with the acquiescence of the President Truman, Rosenman officially offered Jackson the post of chief prosecutor at the victors' tribunal. The offer came with this stipulation: The captured Nazis should first receive a 'fair trial'—and then be hanged! 'Extraordinarily happy about the offer,' Jackson accepted immediately. He had long defended the thesis that in the 20th Century, 19th Century concepts about war no longer applied. He also believed that the USA, on account of its 'leadership role in the world,' was entitled to intervene in any military conflict and act as it saw fit. Jackson announced that in order to 'secure the moral leadership of the USA' he was authorized to 'prove,' with the help of a military tribunal, that 'these damned Germans were solely responsible for the war We need a scapegoat on which to foist the world's evils for a long time to come.'



Robert Jackson

"In consultations preparatory to the tribunal, Jackson ignored the objections advanced by the European allies that the accused could prove, based on documents seized in France, that the Reich was not responsible for the outbreak of World War II; rather, the War had been forced on Germany. They pointed out that the documents would prove that England, France, and the USA had all backed Poland in its stubborn and aggressive attitude toward Germany. After all, Poland had mobilized twice before Germany mobilized. In July 1939, Polish Marshall Rydz-Smigly publicly stated before officers in Thorn that 'Poland wants war and Germany will not be able to prevent it, even if it wants to.' Furthermore, Roosevelt had for all practical purposes declared war against Germany in 1941. The German Declaration of War was completely legitimate, given the provocative American aggressions against German ships and its violation of neutrality by delivering weapons to the British.

"None of that could be mentioned during the trial, of course. Germany must be branded and condemned as the sole guilty party, and the European war had to be presented as German aggression from the very beginning. Brigadier General Telford Taylor, later the chief American advisor for the prosecution, objected that it would not be possible in a fair trial 'to push through the absurd notion of Germany's sole guilt—rather, the opposite will come out.' Finally the USA had driven Hitler into a Polish trap from which he was unable to extricate himself: Churchill and Roosevelt had agreed on the complete annihilation of the German Reich from the very beginning.



Troika: Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill

"To this Jackson retorted: 'Who's talking about a fair trial? Of course the Germans will try to accuse the Allies of pursuing a policy that forced them into war. I expect that, since I know about the documents seized from the German Foreign Office. They all come to the same conclusion: "We have no way out. We must fight; we are encircled; we are being strangled:" Well, it would be a catastrophe if this trial got into a discussion about the political and economic causes of the war. That could cause an unending disaster in both America and Europe

"Taylor concluded, 'That means the question of who is guilty of starting the war

must be avoided at all costs . . . it must not be allowed to come up.' That, however, would be possible only if Jackson could succeed as lawmaker, in setting up the rules of the game for a perfect trial by simply forbidding all discussion of the causes of the war before the tribunal. Jackson took Taylor's remarks as his guidelines and remarked: 'If all documents and statements to this effect are rejected by the court as irrelevant or unimportant, the war policies of the Western Powers, Poland and the USSR cannot be discussed.'



Pax Americana (Anon.)

"Taylor expressed the idea in a metaphor, saying 'The shark pool of European politics between the wars must appear as a carp pond with one single evil pike swimming around.' Jackson added 'And this pike—Hitler naturally—must by the end of the trial have mutated into a monstrous killer shark, threatening to devour all the little fish and striving for world domination.' On 6 June 1945 Jackson reassured Truman with a report setting out the new 'legal concepts' along with his plans for the course of the trial, which included a London conference with jurists from all the other allies. This conference took place in London between June 26 and August 8.

"The French Professor of international law, Dr. Gros, began by pointing out that 'wars of aggression' did not represent a criminal violation of international law If the war were thought of as a 'criminal act of individuals,' however, the law could be bent. The latest book by Trainin [the Soviet expert on international law who took part in the conference] states that 'A war of aggression is to be regarded as an international crime in the sense of the discussions held at the League of Nations.' Compensation can be demanded, but criminal penalties do not ensue. For this reason, he said, one may not invent a punishment. Trainin would have liked to come to a different conclusion; but, as he stated, a 'war of aggression' entails no criminal liability. Furthermore the Joint Declaration made at the Yalta Conference in February 1945 made no mention of the crime of aggressive war.



Adolph Hitler (Fidus, 1941)



Adolph Hitler (B. Bleeker, 1937)

"Jackson reacted to these objections with indignation. He said that the U.S. had conducted total war and paid no attention to international law, unless it had reason to fear retaliation by the enemy. Furthermore, since the U.S. was the most powerful victor, no one was in a position to hinder it from introducing new guidelines in the interest of the Allies. With this in mind he had worked out his own proposal for the prosecution. It contained the following main points: 'Offensive war, invasion, attack in violation of international laws and treaties, along with war as an instrument of national policy.' He stated that he considered charges of war atrocities as being of 'secondary importance.'

"In the course of further discussions he explained: 'As far as specific charges are concerned, the United States are particularly interested in developing the (new) criminal charge of waging aggressive war, in order to depict Germany's entire conduct of the war as illegal. This is because, during the War, I suggested certain measures to President Roosevelt that under international law could be justified only with the theory that Germany's conduct was illegal. In order to justify these measures, the United States have [sic] a particular interest in judicially establishing the illegality of the German war.'

"The French appeals court judge Robert Falco gave Jackson something to consider by pointing out that 'If we go through with this, the court will be punishing the Germans for crimes with which the Allies can also be charged.' Thus the problem was, how could the victors conduct in international court, an international trial for violation of international law, in which Germany's violations of international law would be pilloried and punished, but theirs would not? It had to be anticipated that the world would hurl the response 'But you did the same thing!' back in the victors' faces, and the judges from neutral countries would throw out the whole trial.

" 'At the end, the whole thing would turn into an international tribunal,' Falco lamented. At this point Jackson dropped his mask. His response was, 'You must understand that it is not going to be just an international tribunal, but an international military tribunal! And nobody will have a say about its composition except we and we alone. All the judges will be picked from countries that took part in the War. We will be the ones who frame the court charter, determine the composition of the court, and write the legal code for the court. We will be the court prosecutors and the court judges. In this trial neither the accused nor the witnesses will have a right to testify freely, except perhaps Hermann Göring.'



Reichsmarschall Hermann Goering

"Here Prof. Gros interjected that 'If lawmakers, prosecutors and judges are all the same persons, this fact alone will constitute a decisive objection. In every legal system with which I am familiar, such a composition would be illegal and impossible.' Again he raised the question: 'Besides, how can men who have committed no criminal acts still be accused and sentenced? We French may think that such a thing would be politically desirable, but it is not possible under international law.'

"Jackson had no response to that except a cynical rejection of legal procedure by stating 'I must admit that international law is weak and unclear in support of our position We simply have to explain that the Germans are personally responsible.' Prof. Gros still could not follow his thought. He objected: 'The acts of which the German leaders can be accused is an old familiar story, but the fact remains that no one has ever declared such deeds to be criminal violations of international law. If we do this now, it will be a case of ex post facto lawmaking.'

"Prof. Gros's objection did not impress Jackson in the least: 'You may be right,' he replied. "Precisely for that reason, explanations and discussions of the principles of international law must be restricted to the minimum in the courtroom.' At this point British Attorney General Maxwell-Fyfe interjected: 'What we want to avoid in this trial is a discussion about whether or not the proceedings are violations of international law. We shall simply state what international law is and then not allow any discussion of whether it is international law or not.'

"Jackson reiterated the quintessence of the discussion in these words: 'You are entirely right. After all, the Allies are still technically at war with Germany, even though its military and political institutions have collapsed. Our military court represents a continuation of the war effort of the Allied nations As the victors, we see it as our undisputed right to keep secret from the court every document and every witness that could prove damaging to us.' Prof. Gros again objected, 'But that is turning the entire European legal tradition upside down. So we are not interested in establishing the truth here, we are just interested in winning a judicial victory?' Jackson: 'That's right. And since all the advantages are on our side, our victory before the court is assured.'




Arno Breker: 'Departure of the Warrior' (1942)

"Thus the Nuremberg Tribunal was and remains to this day a triumph of power over the law, committed by criminals who wrapped themselves in judges' robes.

"On 8 August 1945 the London conference ended with the 'Agreement on the Prosecution and Punishment of the Principal War Criminals of the European Axis Powers' including the court statute for this court that was appended to the agreement. The protocols of the London sessions were illegally published four years later as the 'Report of Robert H. Jackson.' If they had been made public in 1945, in any trial conducted according to English Common Law, they would have caused a mistrial. As soon as they knew of these discussions, the judges would have had no choice except to discontinue the trial or begin anew. Those present at the London conference understood this perfectly well: any verdict that was reached before the trial would have to be overruled. The judges who participated in the London discussions were clearly compromised. They were obligated to recuse themselves, but they failed to do this. The precise index of sources for this matter may be found in Hans Meiser's book 'Das Tribunal,' a computerized copy of which is appended hereto.

"When one realizes that the International Military Tribunal was nothing except a victors' consortium for murder, it becomes clear . . . that . . . the so-called 'judges' at Nuremberg accomplished nothing more than rationalizing the murder of the Reich leadership [and] . . . have mercilessly delivered the entire German nation for all time to the 'Auschwitz Cudgel,' with which our enemy is annihilating the soul of the German nation.



ISBN No. 1591480019

"The 'manifest obviousness of the Holocaust' alleged by the courts of OMF/Federal Republic of Germany is but an empty phrase. There is no evidence for the event conjured by this battle cry, as is clearly demonstrated in the appended book by Germar Rudolf: 'Vorlesungen über den Holocaust—Strittige Fragen im Kreuzverhör' ('Lectures on the Holocaust—Controversial Issues Cross Examined'), Castle Hill Publishers, P.O. Box 118, Hastings, TN34 3ZQ, UK (April 2005) [Americans should visit <http://vho.org/store/USA> to purchase this illustrated 568-page book (ISBN No. 1591480019) in English. For all non-Europeans Castle Hill's address is 253 W. 72nd

"Mr. Dehne, perhaps you now understand the panic with which world Jewry is reacting to [Iranian] President Ahmadinejad's announcement that Iran will sponsor a scientific commission and conference to investigate the authenticity of the Holocaust. If, as you state, my participation in the conference planned by the Iranian government would threaten 'serious consequences' for the Bundesrepublik, then you have said everything about the Federal Republic that needs to be said.



President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad

"The Bundesrepublik, along with the Basic Law, is doomed to vanish on the day when 'a constitution goes into effect that has been created by the German nation in a free election.' (Article 146 of the Basic Law.) This will be the day when the German nation through its Reichsordnende Versammlung (Constitutional Convention) officially rejects the historical falsifications sponsored by the enemies of the Reich and reclaims its sovereignty. That day is coming sooner than you think. The Tehran conference will greatly facilitate the dissolution of the Federal Republic, since it is constructed on a great lie that will be demolished in Tehran: the Holocaust Lie.

"In conclusion [said Horst Mahler], I would like to remind you that the German Reich continues to exist. Its laws are still in effect. They can not at present be carried out, for the reason that foreign domination, in clear violation of international law, is hindering the Reich by force from doing so, . When the Reich's ability to function is again secured, actions such as yours will be punishable as treason."



End of 'The "Holocaust" Lie:

Post Extras: 

 [Print Thread](#)

Fair Use Notice

This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We make such material available in an effort to advance awareness and understanding of issues relating to civil rights, economics, individual rights, international affairs, liberty, science & technology, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.

For more information please visit: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>.

If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission directly from the copyright owner.